

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5-10, 12-17, 19 and 20 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 8 and 15 have been amended and claims 4, 11, and 18 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 8 and 15 are independent. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

I. Interview

Applicants appreciate the courtesies shown to Applicants' representative by Examiner Park in the January 27, 2009 personal interview. Applicants' separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

II. Amendment

Claims 1, 8 and 15 have been amended to incorporate the subject matter of dependent claims 4, 11 and 18, respectively. Support for the amendment to claims 1, 8 and 15 can be found in the published specification at, for example, Fig. 8 and paragraph [0169].

III. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §112, First Paragraph

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 8 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Claims 1, 8 and 15 have been amended in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion as discussed during January 27, 2009 personal interview. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

IV. The Claims Define Patentable Subject Matter

The Office Action rejects claims 1-21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0007173 to Nishide et al. (Nishide) in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0160997 to Kimura. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, "the detection result storing unit stores the result of the incompatibility detection processing in a separate location from the image data." Independent claims 8 and 15 recite, *inter alia*, "the storing of the result of the incompatibility

detection processing occurs in a separate location from the image data." The applied references fail to teach or render obvious the above-quoted features of independent claims 1, 8 and 15.

As discussed and acknowledged during January 27, 2009 personal interview, the applied references fail to teach or render obvious that the detection resulting unit stores the result of the incompatibility detection processing in a separate location from the image data, as recited in independent claim 1, and the storing of the result of the incompatibility detection processing occurs in a separate location from the image data, as recited in claims 8 and 15. Thus, the applied references fail to teach or render obvious at least these features of independent claims 1, 8 and 15.

The dependent claims are allowable at least for their dependence from one of independent claims 1, 8 and 15 and for the additional features they recite.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

I. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the pending claims are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Obert H. Chu
Registration No. 52,744

JAO:OHC/wma

Attachment:
Request For Continued Examination

Date: January 29, 2009

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--